



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,629	11/12/2003	Joseph D. Wong	10013526-1	7991
22879	7590	05/02/2007		
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER REZA, MOHAMMAD W	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/706,629	WONG, JOSEPH D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mohammad W. Reza	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the arguments filed on 02/12/2007.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-24 have been rejected.

Response to Amendment

4. The examiner approves the amendments made to claim 21, and 23.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al hereafter Williams (patent application 20050257267) in view of Tonelli et al hereafter Tonelli (US Patent 6229540).

7. As per claim 1, Williams discloses a method comprising: collecting security information from the nodes of the enterprise under audit; analyzing the security

information and providing a first result of this analysis; and a second result comprising security standards applicable to the enterprise under audit and one or more other enterprises that together form a relevant peer group, the result indicating the relative security of the enterprise under audit relative to that of the peer group of enterprises (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). Although, Williams discloses comparing the results (paragraphs, 0101), he does not explicitly disclose comparing this first result with a second result. Nevertheless, it is well known in the network security art at the time of invention that auditing result to be compared with a standard result. Exemplary of this is Tonelli who discloses comparing this first result with a second result (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

Accordingly, it would been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the network security art at the time of invention was made to have incorporated Tonelli's teachings of auditing networks with the teachings of Williams, for the purpose of suitably using the auditing result to compare with a standard result (col. 4-6).

8. As per claim 2, Williams discloses the method in the comparing step, the second result comprises information derived from industry standards applicable to the relevant peer group of enterprises (paragraphs, 0073).

9. As per claim 3, Williams discloses the method wherein, the second result comprises information collecting and analyzing steps to two or more enterprises in the relevant peer group s (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). He does not disclose in the comparing step, derived from information previously obtained through application. However, Tonelli

Art Unit: 2136

discloses in the comparing step, derived from information previously obtained through application (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 3.

10. As per claim 4, Williams discloses the method comprising the step of generating at least one report that presents the first and second results (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). He does not disclose arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison. However, Tonelli discloses arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 4.

11. As per claim 5, Williams discloses the method wherein the generating step includes presenting the first and second results each broken down into several results relating to several different areas of security, with a first and a second result presented for each different area of security (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). He does not disclose arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison. However, Tonelli discloses arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 5.

12. As per claim 6, Williams discloses the method wherein, in the generating step, the results relating to several different areas of security comprise results arising from analysis of personnel security information and physical security information, at least

Art Unit: 2136

some of the information included in the first result having been gathered using interviews during the collecting step (paragraphs, 106, 107).

13. As per claim 7, Williams discloses the method wherein, in the generating step, the results relating to several different areas of security comprise results arising from analysis of password security information and file access permission security information (paragraphs, 0121).

14. As per claim 8, Williams discloses the method wherein, in the generating step, the results relating to several different areas of security further comprise results arising from analysis of personnel security information and physical security information, at least some of the information included in the first result having been gathered using interviews during the collecting step (paragraphs, 106, 107).

15. As per claim 9, Williams discloses the method wherein, in the generating step, the several different areas of security comprise one or more results of analysis of node configuration security information and one or more results of analysis of security information gathered using interviews (paragraphs, 106, 107).

16. As per claim 10, Williams discloses the method wherein, in the generating step, the one or more results of analysis of node configuration security information comprise results arising from analysis of password security information (paragraphs, 0010, 0007).

17. As per claim 11, Williams discloses the method wherein, in the generating step, the one or more results of analysis of node configuration security information comprises results arising from analysis of file access permission security information (paragraphs, 0010, 0007).

Art Unit: 2136

18. As per claim 12, Williams discloses the method wherein, the generating step generates at least two reports in different formats for different requesting parties or uses, and in particular one for technical experts that includes technical language and details and another for non-technical-experts that substantially excludes technical language and details (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). He does not disclose in the comparative of two results. However, Tonelli discloses comparative of two results (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 12.

19. As per claim 13, Williams discloses the method to which is added: generating and executing commands to alter the security information of one or more nodes to improve system security in at least some cases when the analysis or comparison or both indicate security is in need of improvement (paragraphs, 0010, 0007).

20. As per claim 14, Williams discloses the method comprising; generating at least one report that presents the first and second results (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). He does not disclose arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison. However, Tonelli discloses arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 14.

21. As per claim 15, Williams discloses the method wherein the generating commands step generates commands which force the deactivation or correction of one

Art Unit: 2136

or more passwords when the analysis or comparison or both indicate that these one or more passwords are not sufficiently secure (paragraphs, 0010, 0007).

22. As per claim 16, Williams discloses the method wherein the generating commands step generates commands which force alteration of one or more configuration file or control file access permissions if the analysis or comparison or both indicate that the access permissions assigned to these one or more files do not provide adequate system security (paragraphs, 0010, 0007).

23. As per claim 17, Williams discloses a system for auditing the security of an enterprise comprising: a plurality of nodes within the enterprise under audit; collectors associated with the nodes and arranged to collect from the nodes information concerning the security of the enterprise under audit; a security analyzer arranged to analyze the information concerning the security of the enterprise under audit and to provide a first result of this analysis; a data base containing a second result comprising security standards applicable to the enterprise under audit and one or more other enterprises that together form a relevant peer group; to determine the relative security of the enterprise under audit in comparison to that of the enterprises in the relevant peer group (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). Although, Williams discloses comparing the results (paragraphs, 0101), he does not explicitly disclose comparing this first result with a second result. Nevertheless, it is well known in the network security art at the time of invention that auditing result to be compared with a standard result. Exemplary of this is Tonelli who discloses a comparison mechanism arranged to compare the first and second results (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

Art Unit: 2136

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 17.

24. As per claim 18, Williams discloses a system to which is added: a report generator that generates at least one report which presents the first and second results arranged each broken down into several results relating to several different areas of security, with a first and second result presented for each different area of security and arranged in a way (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). He does not disclose arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison. However, Tonelli discloses arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 18.

25. As per claim 19, Williams discloses a system to which is added: change agents associated with the nodes and able to execute commands that alter node configuration information; and a command generator that provides commands to the change agents on selected nodes to alter node configuration information to improve system security in response to the analyzer or comparison mechanism or both determining security improvements are needed (paragraphs, 106, 107).

26. As per claim 20, Williams discloses a system wherein the command generator includes a mechanism that can generate commands which, when executed, cause one or more of the change agents to force the deactivation or correction of one or more secure passwords if the security analyzer or comparison mechanism or both determine that one or more passwords are not sufficiently secure (paragraphs, 106, 107).

Art Unit: 2136

27. As per claim 21, Williams discloses a system wherein the command generator includes ~ a mechanism that can generate commands which, when executed, cause one or more of the change agents to force the alteration of the access permissions of one or more configuration files or control files if the security analyzer or comparison mechanism or both determine that the access permissions assigned to one or more such files do not provide sufficient security (paragraphs, 0010, 0007).

28. As per claim 22, Williams discloses a system for auditing the security of an enterprise comprising: a plurality of nodes within an enterprise under audit; collector means associated with the nodes for collecting information from the nodes concerning the security of the enterprise under audit; security analyzer means for analyzing the information concerning the security of the enterprise under audit and for providing a first result of this analysis; data base means for storing and for presenting a second result comprising security standards applicable to the enterprise under audit and one or more other enterprises that together form a relevant peer group; determine the relative security of the enterprise under audit in comparison to that of the enterprises in the relevant peer group (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). Although, Williams discloses comparing the results (paragraphs, 0101), he does not explicitly disclose comparing this first result with a second result. Nevertheless, it is well known in the network security art at the time of invention that auditing result to be compared with a standard result. Exemplary of this is Tonelli who discloses comparison means for comparing the first and second results (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 22.

29. As per claim 23, Williams discloses a system to which is added report generation means for generating at least one report which presents the first and second results each broken down into several results relating to several different areas of security, with a first and second result presented for each different area of security (paragraphs, 0010, 0007). He does not disclose arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison.

However, Tonelli discloses arranged in a way that facilitates their comparison (col. 4, lines 27-42, col. 22, lines 8-19).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 23.

30. As per claim 24, Williams discloses a system to which is added change agent means associated with the nodes for executing commands that alter node configuration information; and

command generator means for providing commands to the change agent means on selected nodes as needed to alter system configuration information to improve system security in response to the security analyzer means or the comparison means or both determining that security improvements are needed (paragraphs, 0010, 0007).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2136

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad w. Reza whose telephone number is 571-272-6590. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MOAZZAMI NASSER G can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohammad Wasim Reza

AU 2136

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


4129107